arXiv:math/0010128v1 [math.FA] 12 Oct 2000

TWO CHARACTERIZATIONS OF THE STANDARD UNIT VECTOR BASIS OF l_1

DAVID MITRA

Abstract. We show that for a sequence in a Banach space, the property of being stable under large perturbations characterizes the property of being equivalent to the unit vector basis of l_1. We show that a normalized unconditional basic sequence in l_1 that is semi-normalized in l_∞ is equivalent to the standard unit vector basis of l_1.

1. Introduction

In this note, we present two results concerning the standard unit vector basis of l_1. The first result, Theorem 1, characterizes, up to equivalence, the standard unit vector basis of l_1 as the unique sequence satisfying a certain stability property. This result is a generalization of [6, Theorem II.11.5]. Our second result, Theorem 2, characterizes, among the sequences in l_1 that are semi-normalized in both l_1 and l_∞, those that are unconditionally basic as simply those that are equivalent to the standard unit vector basis of l_1. In contrast to Theorem 2, we present Proposition 1, which shows that not every copy of the standard unit vector basis of l_1 in l_1 is semi-normalized in l_∞.

Throughout this note, we shall use the following notations: $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{Y}$ denote infinite dimensional, real Banach spaces; the symbol I_{1p} denotes the formal identity operator from l_1 into l_p; we denote the standard unit vector basis of l_1 by $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^\infty$; finally, we denote the i^{th}-coordinate of a

---

Date: September 19, 2000.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46B45; Secondary: 46B15.

Key words and phrases. Banach space, Unconditional basic sequence, unit vector basis of l_1.

This work is a subset of the results contained in the author's dissertation, *Sequences that are unconditionally basic in both l_1 and l_2*, which was written under the direction of Professor Maria Girardi.

sequence of real numbers x by $x(i)$. All other notation and terminology, not otherwise explained, are as in [3].

We now recall the definitions pertinent to the foregoing discussion.

Definition 1. The *unconditional basis constant* of an unconditional basic sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathfrak{X}$ is the smallest constant K_1 satisfying, for any sequence of signs $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n=1}^{m}$ and for any sequence of scalars $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{m}$, the inequality

$$\left\|\sum_{n=1}^{m} \epsilon_n \alpha_n x_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq K_1 \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{m} \alpha_n x_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}}.$$

Definition 2. A sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathfrak{X}$ is (K_1, K_2)*-equivalent to the sequence* $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathfrak{X}$, provided that there exists a pair of positive numbers K_1, K_2 such that

$$K_1 \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{m} \alpha_n y_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{m} \alpha_n x_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq K_2 \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{m} \alpha_n y_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}},$$

for each sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{m}$ of scalars. We say that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is *equivalent* to $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ if it is (K_1, K_2)-equivalent to $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ for some pair of positive numbers K_1, K_2.

2. The Results

Our first result concerns perturbations of basic sequences equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. We first recall the classical result, due to Bessaga and Pełczyński (see [1]), on perturbations of basic sequences, which states that a basic sequence is "stable under small perturbations".

Fact 1. *Let* $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be a basic sequence in* $\mathfrak{X}$ *with coefficient functionals* $\{x_n^*\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. *If* $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is a sequence in* $\mathfrak{X}$ *satisfying*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n^*\|_{[x_i]_{\mathfrak{X}}^*} \|x_n - y_n\|_{\mathfrak{X}} < 1,$$

then $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is a basic sequence, equivalent to* $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

In [6, Theorem II.11.5], it is proved that $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is actually "stable under large perturbations". To clarify this vague statement, and to facilitate our discussion, we make the following definition.

Definition 3. A sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in a Banach space $\mathfrak{X}$ is a δ-*dominated perturbation* of a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathfrak{X}$ provided

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|x_n - y_n\|_{\mathfrak{X}} < \delta. \tag{1}$$

The result in [6] mentioned above states that any 1-dominated perturbation of $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. According to Singer, this result is contained in the paper [4] of V. D. Milman, who, in turn, attributes the result to V. I. Gurariĭ. In Theorem 1, we show that, in fact, Definition 3 may be used to characterize those sequences that are equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a normalized sequence in $\mathfrak{X}$. The following conditions on $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are equivalent.*

1) *$\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is equivalent to the standard unit vector basis of l_1.*
2) *There exists a positive number δ such that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly equivalent to any δ-dominated perturbation of itself; that is, such that the constants K_1 and K_2 appearing in Definition 2 depend only on the supremum appearing in equation* (1)*.*
3) *There exists a positive number δ such that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$is equivalent to any δ-dominated perturbation of itself.*
4) *l_1 is isomorphically embedded in $\mathfrak{X}$, and there exists a positive number δ such that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$is equivalent to any δ-dominated perturbation of itself.*

Proof. To see that condition 1) implies condition 2), suppose (as we may) that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is $(k,1)$-equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. Take $\delta = k$ and let $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a δ-dominated perturbation of $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. Then $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is norm bounded; and so, since $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, we may define a bounded linear operator $T\colon [x_n]_{\mathfrak{X}} \to [y_n]_{\mathfrak{X}}$ by setting

$$T\Bigl(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n\Bigr) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n y_n, \qquad \text{for } x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n.$$

Moreover, for $x = \sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n$, we have, setting $m = \sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|x_n - y_n\|_{\mathfrak{X}}$, that

$$\|(I-T)x\|_{\mathfrak{X}} = \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n(x_n - y_n)\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|x_n - y_n\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n| \leq \frac{m}{k}\|x\|_{\mathfrak{X}}.$$

Since $mk^{-1} < 1$, by a well-known result, T is an isomorphism from $[x_n]_{\mathfrak{X}}$ onto $[y_n]_{\mathfrak{X}}$ satisfying

$$\frac{k}{k+m}\left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n y_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq \frac{k}{k-m}\left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n y_n\right\|_{\mathfrak{X}},$$

for each $x = \sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n$, as desired.

It is obvious that condition 2) implies condition 3).

To see that condition 3) implies the first (and non-trivial) part of condition 4), first assume that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a weakly Cauchy subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and let $\{z_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be an arbitrary normalized sequence in $\mathfrak{X}$. Let $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be the δ-dominated perturbation of $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ defined by

$$y_j = \begin{cases} x_{n_k} - \frac{\delta}{2} z_k, & \text{if } j = n_k; \\ x_j, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, by hypothesis, $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is equivalent to $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. From this, it follows that the linear map $\widetilde{T}\colon \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \to \{y_n\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ given by $\widetilde{T}x_n = y_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ extends to a well-defined linear isomorphism $T\colon [x_n]_{\mathfrak{X}} \to [y_n]_{\mathfrak{Y}}$. In particular, the map T is weak-weak continuous. Thus, since $\{x_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is weakly Cauchy, so is $\{y_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} = \{x_{n_k} - \delta z_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. But then we arrive at the contradiction that the arbitrary normalized sequence $\{z_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is weakly Cauchy. It must be that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has no weakly Cauchy subsequence, whence the result follows by Rosenthal's l_1-theorem [5].

Towards showing that condition 4) implies condition 1), let $\{z_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a normalized sequence in $\mathfrak{X}$ equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. Let $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be the δ-dominated perturbation of $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ defined by

$$y_n = x_n + \tfrac{\delta}{2} z_n.$$

Then, by hypothesis, $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is (k_1, k_2)-equivalent to $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ for some pair of positive numbers k_1, k_2. Thus, for any sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{m}$ of scalars we have

$$\Big\|\sum_{n=1}^{m}\alpha_n x_n\Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \geq k_1\Big\|\sum_{n=1}^{m}\alpha_n y_n\Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \geq k_1\left(\Big\|\sum_{n=1}^{m}\tfrac{\delta}{2}\,\alpha_n z_n\Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}} - \Big\|\sum_{n=1}^{m}\alpha_n x_n\Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}}\right);$$

whence,

$$\frac{2(1+k_1)}{\delta\cdot k_1}\Big\|\sum_{n=1}^{m}\alpha_n x_n\Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \geq \Big\|\sum_{n=1}^{m}\alpha_n z_n\Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}}.$$

Condition 1) now follows since $\{z_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. $\square$

By Singer's result, any 1-dominated perturbation of $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ yields a copy of $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ consisting of vectors that still possess large norm in l_∞. Our next result, Theorem 2, is related to this observation. It states that any normalized unconditional basic sequence in l_1 consisting of vectors with large l_∞-norm is equivalent to $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. The proof of Theorem 2 is a consequence of the following fact, which, in turn, is a consequence of Szarek's refinement of the Khintchine inequality (c.f. [2]).

Fact 2. *The operator* $\mathrm{I}_{12}\colon l_1 \to l_2$ *is absolutely summing; that is,* I_{12} *maps unconditionally convergent series into absolutely convergent series. Moreover, if the sequence* $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *in* l_1 *has unconditional basis constant* C*, then for any sequence of scalars* $\{\alpha_i\}_{1=1}^{n}$ *we have*

$$\Big\|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_i x_i\Big\|_{l_1} \geq \frac{1}{C\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|\alpha_i\,\mathrm{I}_{12}\,x_i\|_{l_2}$$

Theorem 2. *Let* $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be a normalized* K*-unconditional basic sequence in* l_1*. If, for some* $1 < p \leq \infty$,

$$\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\|\,\mathrm{I}_{1p}\,x_n\|_{l_p} > 0, \tag{2}$$

then $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is* $(k,1)$*-equivalent to the standard unit vector basis of* l_1*, where* $k = \frac{1}{K\sqrt{2}}\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\|\,\mathrm{I}_{12}\,x_n\|_{l_2}$.

Proof. First note that if $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a semi-normalized sequence in l_1 such that $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\|\,\mathrm{I}_{1p}\,x_n\|_{l_p} > 0$ for some $1 < p \leq \infty$, then we necessarily have $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \| \mathrm{I}_{1p}\, x_n\|_{l_p} > 0$ for each $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Indeed, this is obvious for $p = \infty$, while for $1 < p < \infty$ and for $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n^1 \in l_1$ we have:

$$\| \mathrm{I}_{1p}\, x\|_{l_p}^p = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_i|^{p-1}|\alpha_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \| \mathrm{I}_{1\infty}\, x\|_{l_\infty}^{p-1}|\alpha_i| \leq \| \mathrm{I}_{1\infty}\, x\|_{l_\infty}^{p-1} \cdot \|x\|_{l_1}.$$

Thus, $\{\mathrm{I}_{1\infty}\, x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is semi-normalized if both $\{\mathrm{I}_{1p}\, x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ are, whence the result follows.

In particular, equation (2) holds for $p = 2$. Using the triangle inequality and Fact 2, we have, for any sequence of scalars $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_i| \geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i x_i \right\|_{l_1} \geq \frac{1}{K\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\alpha_i\, \mathrm{I}_{12}\, x_i\|_{l_2} \geq k \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_i|,$$

as desired. □

Finally, for a dual purpose, we present Proposition 1. First, we see from Proposition 1, that the converse of Theorem 2 fails. Secondly, Proposition 1 sheds light on Theorem 1. Note here that, for each $\epsilon > 0$, any normalized unconditional basis of l_1 is a $(2+\epsilon)$-dominated perturbation of $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. It is thus natural to find the smallest number C such that the following statement holds: for each $\epsilon > 0$, any normalized basis of l_1 is a $(C+\epsilon)$-dominated perturbation of $\{e_n^1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. From Proposition 1, we obtain that $C = 2$.

Proposition 1. *There is a semi-normalized unconditional basis of* l_1, *hence a basis that is equivalent to the standard unit vector basis of* l_1, *satisfying*

$$\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \| \mathrm{I}_{1\infty}\, x_n\|_{l_\infty} = 0,$$

where $\mathrm{I}_{1\infty}$ *is the formal identity operator from* l_1 *into* l_∞.

To construct the required basis, we need the following lemma, whose proof, although certainly well-known, is provided for completeness.

Lemma 1. *Let* $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *be a basis of* l_1^n *with the corresponding sequence of coefficient functionals* $\{x_i^*\}_{i=1}^n$. *Then* $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is* (k_1, k_2)*-equivalent to* *the standard unit vector basis of* l_1^n, *where* $k_1^{-1} = \max_{1\le i\le n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |x_j^*(i)|$ *and* $k_2 = \max_{1\le j\le n} \|x_j\|_{l_1^n}$.

Proof. We need to show that

$$k_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_i| \le \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i x_i \right\|_{l_1^n} \le k_2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_i|.$$

for any sequence of scalars $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$. The right hand inequality follows from the triangle inequality. Towards proving the left hand inequality, let $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be given and write

$$z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i e_i,$$

where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ denotes the standard unit vector basis of l_1^n. Then for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we have $\alpha_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i x_j^*(i)$; whence,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} |\alpha_j| = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i x_j^*(i) \right| \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_i| \sum_{j=1}^{n} |x_j^*(i)| \le \frac{1}{k_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_i| = \frac{1}{k_1} \|z\|_{l_1^n},$$

as desired. □

Proof of Proposition 1. To construct the sequence heralded by Proposition 1, it suffices to find, for each integer $n > 2$, a basis $\{x_i^n\}_{i=1}^n$ of l_1^n such that both of the following statements hold:

1) $\{x_i^n\}_{i=1}^n$ is $(\frac{1}{5}, 2)$-equivalent to the standard unit vector basis of l_1^n.
2) $\max_{1\le i\le n} |x_1(i)| = 1/n$.

Towards this end, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ denote the standard unit vector basis of l_1^n. Define

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tfrac{1}{n} e_i \\ x_i &= e_1 + e_i \quad \text{for } 2 \le i \le n \end{aligned}$$

(we drop the superscripts for notational clarity). Then we have condition 2), and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a linearly independent sequence with coefficient functionals $\{x_i^*\}_{i=1}^n$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^* &= \tfrac{-n}{n-2}e_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \tfrac{n}{n-2}e_i \\ x_j^* &= \tfrac{1}{n-2}e_1 + \tfrac{n-3}{n-2}e_j + \sum_{i\notin\{j,1\}} \tfrac{-1}{n-2}e_i \quad \text{for } 2 \le j \le n. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 1, it is easily verified that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is $(1/5, 2)$-equivalent to $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$. □

Acknowledgements The author would like to thank the members of the Functional Analysis Seminar at the University of South Carolina for their interest in this work, and for their helpful suggestions towards simplifying and generalizing the results of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bessaga and A. Pełczyński, *On bases and unconditional convergence of series in Banach spaces*, Studia Math.**17**(1958), 151-164.
- [2] J. Lindenstrauss and A. Pełczyński, *Absolutely summing operators in $\mathcal{L}_p$-spaces and their applications*, Studia Mathematica **29** (1968), 275-326.
- [3] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces*, vol. I, Classics in Mathematics, Springer–Verlag, New York Heidelberg Berlin, 1996.
- [4] V. D. Milman, *Perturbations of sequences of elements of a Banach space*, Sibirsk. Mat. Ž. **6** (1965), 398-412 (Russian).
- [5] H. P. Rosenthal *A characterization of Banach spaces containing l_1*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (USA) **71** (1974), 2411-2413.
- [6] Ivan Singer, *Bases in Banach Spaces*, vol. I, Springer–Verlag, New York Heidelberg Berlin, 1970.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, SC 29208, U.S.A.
E-mail address: `mitra@math.sc.edu`